Concern Regarding Judicial Integrity and Conduct of Judge Charlene Jackson

Prohibited Practice of Law While Serving as a Judge (Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 3.10)

Judge Jackson has engaged in conduct explicitly prohibited by **Rule 3.10 of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct**, which states unequivocally: **"A judge shall not practice law."**

1. **Public Admission of Dual Roles:** In a widely accessible media report (Phoenix New Times, December 2022), Judge Jackson publicly identified herself as both a Maricopa County Superior Court Judge *and* **"an attorney representing the Hualapai Tribe."** This public, non-hearsay admission confirms a serious, ongoing, or recent breach of judicial ethics that creates severe conflicts of interest and compromises the full-time attention required of a judicial officer.

2. **Dual Role Conflicts:** While sitting as a Superior Court Judge, Jackson's concurrent capacity as an attorney for the Hualapai Tribe not only violated Rule 3.10 but also diverted her attention from her duties and created unavoidable conflicts that taint the integrity of her official judicial actions.

> "We underestimated the number of commercial operators who came here and sought out tribal partnerships," said Charlene Jackson, an attorney representing the Hualapai Tribe near Kingman and a Maricopa County Superior Court judge. "A competitive wave is coming in. It's a little bit scary for us."
>
> Tribes can't compete with the capital held by commercial operators such as Caesars, BetMGM, and FanDuel, Jackson said. While the Las Vegas bigwigs doled out billions of dollars on splashy bait to hook new Arizona sports bettors, tribes were scrambling to compete for licenses and find partners.
>
> "Quite frankly, we were left behind," Jackson said. "The numbers reflect that."

Material Omissions and Misrepresentation in Judicial Application (Rules 1.2 & 2.16)

Judge Jackson's application materials submitted to the Judicial Nominating Commission (JNC) and the Governor's Office, as well as her official Maricopa County Superior Court biography, appear to constitute material misrepresentation and concealment of professional history.

1. **Concealment of Judicial and Legal History:** Publicly verifiable professional documents (including presenter bios for tribal and legal conferences) list several significant judicial and legal roles that are conspicuously **omitted** from her official judicial application and subsequent Maricopa County Superior Court biography.

   These omissions include:
   a. **Appellate Judge for the Hualapai Tribe** (listed on a 2017 presenter bio, omitted from Superior Court bio).
   b. **Judge Pro Tem positions for the Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada** (listed on a public resume, omitted from Superior Court bio).
   c. **Attorney for the Hualapai Tribe** as Judge Jackson identifies herself as in the Phoenix New Times article.

2. **Breach of Candor and Public Confidence:** The JNC application explicitly requires full disclosure of prior legal and judicial experience to assess qualifications and fitness for service. Knowingly failing to disclose prior judicial service is a breach of candor, violates **Rule 1.2 (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary)**, and is grounds for judicial misconduct investigation.

3. **Statutory Violations:** These omissions of material facts, submitted to public offices under penalty of perjury for the purpose of securing a judicial appointment, appear to constitute **Perjury** in violation of **A.R.S. § 13-2702** and/or the **Presentment of False Instrument for Filing** in violation of **A.R.S. § 39-161**. This is a direct assault on the integrity of the selection process.